

From: John Mills
Sent: Monday, August 02, 2004 3:18 PM
To: Dabbs, Paul
Cc: Virginia Cahill
Subject: Vol 1, chapter 3 comments...

Comments on Volume 1
Chapter 3

John S. Mills

Page 1, General observation. The paper seems to assume a "regional entity" exists for each of the State's 10 hydrologic regions. I do not believe this to be the case. Indeed, there are in some cases, competing local entities, within the same region, with competing strategies for dealing with resource challenges associated with water. This factor should be recognized in how to plan for future uncertainties. That is, while the State and regional entities will have a role in evaluating and resolving uncertainties, there will be much of this work being done at the local level. DWR should recognize this reality and attempt to integrate it into future regional efforts such as 160-08. The ultimate goal should be a regional response, but we are not there yet.

Similarly, within regions there are varying degrees of accepted risk by local agencies. Therefore, an overarching regional level of accepted risk may not be established, unless the lowest common denominator approach is used.

Page 2 does not contain a discussion of events that could occur - external to the State - which may require a State response of more agricultural land in production. In keeping with a wide range of possible future scenarios, wouldn't this be one to consider? The latter point perhaps given the potential for changes in (global) climate external to the State and/or the nation. These comments would also apply to Page 6 (Global Climate Change).

Page 12 Data Gaps. I agree with your finding of significant data gaps. I suggest that if some of these are to be successfully filled there will have to be technical and financial assistance from the State to local and regional entities.

Page 13 first bullet. I suggest the term "sustainable" be applied to ground water as well as the other terms.

Page 14 Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 descriptions. The two phrases; "...restoring its environment..." and "...respectful of the environment..." are not particularly enlightening in their descriptive powers. I suggest the following:

Scenario 2 - California is more efficient in 2030 water use than today while growing its economy within much more environmental protective policies.

Scenario 3 - California is highly productive in its economic sector. Its environment, while still important is not the State's number 1 priority for resource decisions. There is less efficient use in 2030 of water resources

than today, but to accommodate the economic demands of the system, greater fiscal resources are deployed in the development of water resources.

Page 15 and 16 - For each of the three Scenarios do we have an estimate of what the total Environmental needs for water will be? At least a rough estimate would be helpful to include here.

Page 16, Environment. How do the creation of additional wetlands over extended periods of time fit with public health protections related to things such as the West Nile Virus? At some point wetlands creation may become a significant vector control problem.

END